10/23/71

Dear Jim,

Before she put you on the phone yesterday and after she said Bud had left his office Mary told me about your "conversation" with Dick on the way in from the airport. That is to say, she gave me a brief but pointed description of your remarks, nothing about what, if anything, he said. I hope this also means that there is the first dim realization on Bud's part, too.

Between the enclosed letter to Bud and the copy of mine of today to Jerry you can get the essence of what we discussed by phone and what he said in the short letter. I am just a bit puzzled by his emphasis on Jimmie's not giving any thought to making a break. As I have told or shown you, he has been emphasizing this for some time, probably since I first raised the feeling with him. He may have some assurance from Jimmie (which could be just to put him on or could be for real), it may be his interpretation, and I suppose it could be suspected that he might be putting me on a bit is he might be involved in any such caper. I am certain that Jimmie will not make any attempt without knowing that what he might regard as "help" awaits him outside.

I have no immediate plans for going to DC this coming week. I have someone coming here Thursday midday for overnight. If there is any need, I can go in about of shortly after lunchtime.

I have a copy of the LATimes' of 10/19 story by Ron Einstoss but haven't had a chance to read it. Anyway, don't make a copy for me, thanks.

What a "coincidence" that Young'r delayed until the same time to "answer" me! Later: I've read the Einstoss story. Is is more inadequate than the CBS wire copy, which I have. That makes clear, as I told you by phone, that the only bullet referred to by Busch is the wrong one, one removed from a cervical vertebra, which is not the fatal bullet. Busch has really adressed nothing, his investigation is little better than a fake, and his announcements is a deception. If your LA people haven't spotted this, you are wasting your time with them. And it is one helluva a "refutation" of charges against Wolfer to defend him by saying he made such a mistake as to mislabel specimens~~x~~ in any murder case. That is the best Busch has. Interestingly, the LATimes story gives as the purpose of the "investigation, "' so there would be no loss of confidence on the part of the public' as to whether "olfer used proper procedures".

I'm filing the CBS copy with this in my Blehr files, where I'm keeping all these items, in the event, as I think you should, you want to go over this when next you are here. I didn't file it earlier on the chance you might be bringing Mary up or I might be going down.

If one ones to be subtle, one might conclude that despite the straight play, the LAT, by beginning the story on page 3 and then jumping it to 20, reflects a sort of lack of confidence in Busch's statement. Ordinarily, I think it would be a page 1 story. But I'm not the LATimes, am I?

If the LA people are more competent than I have any reason to believe, they can use Busch's statement as confirmation of their claims. I could, assuming there is nothing in the full statement not in essence in what I now have. If you get a copy of his full statement, I'd like a copy to go over whenever I can find time....I've gone over the decisions, and the one involving a different judge that Williams, it seems to me, is quite in point. When you have time I think that you should go over what I've gotten from my efforts in the New England matter, but until there is courtroom need, it will have to be between the two of us. I'm going to get violent of any one other thing on which I've put in time and effort, both of which I lack, is blown on me. There is much to do on this, very much, but it is promosing. I think very promising. If I could get to the right place, I have reason to believe even the prosecutor would talk to me and that he has big doubts identical with mine.

Best,